

STATE OF CONNECTICUT HOSPITAL PAYMENT MODERNIZATION ISSUE PAPER — HOSPITAL REVENUE NEUTRALITY

Issue Description:	The Connecticut Department of Social Services (DSS) has selected a goal of hospital-specific revenue neutrality for the initial implementation of All Patient Refined Diagnosis Related Groups (APR-DRG) payments. The State of Connecticut acute care hospital reimbursement is currently based on a hospital-specific target cost per discharge, as well as pass-through amounts calculated during a retrospective reconciliation process. As the State transitions to APR-DRG payments starting on January 1, 2015, how will hospital-specific revenue neutrality be addressed?
Analytical Lead:	James Matthisen
Contributors:	Amy Perry, Jean Ellen Schulik, Scott Simerly
Revision Date:	September 15, 2014
Status:	Revised Draft

Overview

The initial implementation of the APR-DRG payment system is intended to be revenue neutral by hospital. Revenue neutrality will be based on 2012 hospital-specific reconciliation data. This issue paper identifies how the various components of the 2012 reconciliation process will be handled under the APR-DRG system.

Definition and Context

In this case “revenue neutrality” means:

1. A new, more accurate payment system will be developed based on an analytical data set.
2. The new payment system will generate the same revenue to each hospital as the current system, assuming the same utilization of services as contained in the analytical data set, subject to the approaches defined in the remainder of this paper.
3. By design, the revenue neutral system is *not* likely to generate the same payments as the prior system when utilization patterns change, however, because it more accurately recognizes current acuity:
 - A. If the first year utilization were exactly the same as the base year, revenue would remain the same.
 - B. If the first year utilization is almost identical, but with one higher acuity admission — revenue will increase accordingly (and be higher than the current method would generate).
 - C. If the first year utilization is almost identical, but with one lower acuity admission — revenue will decrease accordingly (and be lower than the current method would generate).

Current Payment Methodology

The current State of Connecticut acute hospital inpatient reimbursement methodology pays a hospital-specific per diem rate which is retrospectively reconciled to a hospital specific per discharge target rate, plus a pass-through of other costs.

The basics of the current reconciliation formula include:

- The Lower of 1) program discharges x target amount per discharge; or 2) total program inpatient operating costs (excluding capital-related costs, provider-based physician costs and medical education costs).
Plus:
- Capital-related costs for Medicaid inpatient routine and ancillary services.
- Program provider-based physician costs.
- Organ acquisition costs (kidney, liver, and heart).
- Medicare Severity DRG payments for heart and liver transplants (with offset of standard discharge payment).
- Costs for burn units certified by the American Burn Association.
- Direct graduate medical education payments (GME).
Offset by:
- Indemnity payments — other party payors.
- Hospital acquired condition (HAC) payment adjustment.

In addition, under the current system there are various supplemental payments (for example, disproportionate share payments) made to hospitals which have been paid outside the reconciliation process, and will remain outside the APR-DRG system.

APR-DRG Payment Methodology

The new payment methodology is intended to establish prospective payment, and seeks to eliminate or limit the need for retrospective reconciliation. The table below addresses each of the items from the current reconciliation process with respect to its inclusion or exclusion from the new target amount.

Item from 2012 Reconciliation	Include in Target?	Notes
Lower of 1) target amount; or 2) inpatient (IP) operating costs (excluding capital, provider-based physicians, and medical education)	Y	2012 adult behavioral health and rehabilitation will be separately identified.
Capital-related costs for Medicaid inpatient routine and ancillary services	Y	Capital costs based on 2012 reconciliation amounts.
Program provider-based physician costs	N	Transitioning to direct billing under the professional fee schedules.
Organ acquisition costs (kidney, heart, and liver)	N	Organ acquisition costs will be handled outside of the APR-DRG system.

Item from 2012 Reconciliation	Include in Target?	Notes
Heart and liver transplants	Y	Transplants will be paid via APR-DRG.
Costs for burn units certified by the American Burn Association	Y	Burn admissions will be paid via APR-DRG.
Direct GME Payments	N	GME will be handled as a separate calculation and payment.
Indemnity payments — other party payors	N	Third party liability recoveries will be removed at the time of claims adjudication.
HAC payment adjustment	N	Claims will be reduced for HAC at the time of claims adjudication.

In addition, the target will include payments for Child Behavioral Health (less the hospital based physician portion of those payments).

The process above results in total hospital revenue neutral target payments, which include IP claims that will be paid under an APR-DRG method and adult and child behavioral health and rehabilitation under a per diem method.

Total hospital target payments will be comprised of four separate categories:

1. Adult behavioral health claims.
2. Child behavioral health claims.
3. Rehabilitation claims.
4. APR-DRG claims.

The following example details the derivation of the revenue neutral rate.

Connecticut Department of Social Services Example Revenue Neutrality Calculation

Data Inputs

Hospital-Specific Revenue Neutral Target Payments
(includes payment for child behavioral health claims)
Hospital-Specific Number of Discharges
Documentation and Coding Improvements (DCI) Reserve Percentage
Hospital-Specific Case Mix Index (CMI)
Hospital-Specific Indirect Medical Education (IME) Factor
Hospital-Specific Calculated Outlier Payments
Hospital-Specific Number of Adult Behavioral Health Days
(includes substance abuse)
Hospital-Specific Number of Child Behavioral Health Days
(includes substance abuse)
Hospital-Specific Number of Rehab Days
Hospital-Specific Adult Behavioral Health Per Diem Rate
Hospital-Specific Child Behavioral Health Per Diem Rate
Hospital-Specific Rehab Per Diem Rate

	\$ 21,000,000
	2,910
	5%
	0.9233
	N/A
	\$ 950,000
	4,500
	1,000
	750
	\$ 1,050
	\$ 1,050
	\$ 1,370

Step 1: Calculate Estimated Adult Behavioral Health Payments

Hospital-Specific Adult Behavioral Health Per Diem Rate
multiply: Hospital-Specific Number of Adult Behavioral Health Days
Hospital-Specific Adult Behavioral Health Payments

	\$1,050
x	4,500
= \$	4,725,000

Step 2: Calculate Estimated Child Behavioral Health Payments

Hospital-Specific Child Behavioral Health Per Diem Rate
multiply: Hospital-Specific Number of Child Behavioral Health Days
Hospital-Specific Child Behavioral Health Payments

	\$1,050
x	1,000
= \$	1,050,000

Step 3: Calculate Estimated Rehab Payments

Hospital-Specific Rehab Per Diem Rate
multiply: Hospital-Specific Number of Rehab Days
Hospital-Specific Rehab Payments

	\$1,370
x	750
= \$	1,027,500

Step 4: Calculate Hospital-Specific DCI Reserve

Hospital-Specific Revenue Neutral Target Payments
subtract: Hospital-Specific Adult Behavioral Health Payments
subtract: Hospital-Specific Child Behavioral Health Payments
subtract: Hospital-Specific Rehab Payments
Hospital-Specific Revenue Neutral Target less Behavioral Health and Rehab
multiply: DCI Reserve %
Hospital-Specific DCI Reserve

	\$21,000,000
-	\$4,725,000
-	\$1,050,000
-	\$1,027,500
=	\$14,197,500
x	5%
=	\$709,875

Step 5: Calculate Hospital-Specific APR-DRG Base Rate

Hospital-Specific Revenue Neutral Target Payments		\$21,000,000
subtract: Hospital-Specific Adult Behavioral Health Payments	-	\$4,725,000
subtract: Hospital-Specific Child Behavioral Health Payments	-	\$1,050,000
subtract: Hospital-Specific Rehab Payments	-	\$1,027,500
subtract: Hospital-Specific DCI Reserve	-	\$709,875
subtract: Hospital-Specific Calculated Outlier Payments	-	\$950,000
Hospital-Specific Inlier Portion Revenue Neutral Target Payments	=	\$12,537,625
divide by: Hospital-Specific CMI	/	0.9233
divide by: 1 + Hospital-Specific IME		N/A
divide by: Hospital-Specific Number of Discharges	/	2,910
Hospital-Specific APR-DRG Base Rate		\$4,666

Step 6: Revenue Neutral Target Check

Hospital-Specific Number of Discharges		2,910
multiply: Hospital-Specific APR-DRG Base Rate	x	\$4,666
multiply: Hospital-Specific CMI	x	0.9233
multiply: 1 + Hospital-Specific IME	x	N/A
Hospital-Specific Inlier Portion Revenue Neutral Target Payments	=	\$12,537,625
add: Hospital-Specific Calculated Outlier Payments	+	\$950,000
add: Hospital-Specific Adult Behavioral Health Payments	+	\$4,725,000
add: Hospital-Specific Child Behavioral Health Payments	+	\$1,050,000
add: Hospital-Specific Rehab Payments	+	\$1,027,500
Total Hospital-Specific Acute Care Payments	=	\$20,290,125
add: Hospital-Specific DCI Reserve	+	\$709,875
Hospital-Specific Revenue Neutral Target Payments	=	\$21,000,000

Follow-up Questions

In a meeting with hospitals and the Connecticut Hospital Association questions arose around the interactions of the policies for outliers and transfers with the goal of revenue neutrality.

Specifically, there were concerns that these policies could mathematically reduce the base rate, and that future year revenue neutrality will not be maintained if, for example, the number or ratio of outliers is not consistent with the data year.

Restating from above, for this project “revenue neutrality” means:

1. A new, more accurate payment system will be developed based on an analytical data set.
2. The new payment system will generate the same revenue to each hospital as the current system, assuming the same utilization of services as contained in the analytical data set, subject to the approaches defined in the remainder of this paper.
3. By design, the revenue neutral system is *not* likely to generate the same payments as the prior system when utilization patterns change, however, because it more accurately recognizes current acuity.

The discussion below attempts to add clarity on these topics.

Outliers

1. The outlier system pays more (and more accurately) for hospitals that experience the higher costs of the most difficult cases. This policy recognizes that acuity, and reduces disincentives to providing services that are associated with higher odds of outlier cases occurring (for example, immature neonates, trauma cases, etc.).
 - A. If the first year utilization were exactly the same as the base year, revenue would remain as modeled (revenue neutral).
 - B. If the first year utilization is almost identical, but with additional outlier admissions — revenue will increase accordingly (and be higher than the current method would provide). Payment will be more accurate because the costs associated with the first year’s utilization will be higher as well.
 - C. If the first year utilization is almost identical, but with fewer outlier admissions — revenue will decrease (and be lower than the current method would provide), based on lower total acuity. Payment will be more accurate because the costs associated with the first year’s utilization will be lower as well.

See the attached Examples.

Transfers

1. For transfer cases, a full course of treatment is typically not provided, thus these cases generate lower cost cases than the average within a DRG. Thus, within a DRG reimbursement system, transfer cases receive a prorated payment to reflect these lower costs. The discussion with the hospitals on this topic was more focused on the definition of transfers than on the transfer payment policy. Two different kinds of transfers were identified:
 - A. Medical to Behavioral Health.
 - B. Medical to Medical (more acute facility).

DSS has determined that the Medical to Behavioral Health transfers will be treated as two separate payment events — an APR-DRG payment being made for the first event and per diem payment being made for the second event. These situations will be considered as two admissions and not trigger the “transfer payment policy”.

The transfer policy for the Medical to Medical transfer (to a facility that can handle a higher level of acuity) represents a very small portion of total costs, solves a difficult problem of paying the transferring hospital far too much, or nothing at all, and has the effect of increasing the base rate (relative to paying both facilities using a high cost APR-DRG weight). If DSS paid the full APR-DRG payment to both facilities, there would be an incentive for hospitals to increase the number of transfers. If DSS did not pay anything to the transferring facility, there could be an incentive to retain cases that would be better handled in a different facility.

The hospital from which the member is transferred will be reimbursed a per diem, based upon the DRG base payment divided by the DRG average length of stay. The resulting amount is multiplied by the sum of one plus the actual length of stay, not to exceed the total DRG base payment.

The hospital to which the member is transferred shall be reimbursed the full APR-DRG payment without any reduction due to the transfer.



Payment Comparison with and without Outlier Claim

Example 1 — Reimbursement Methodology Includes an Outlier Policy

Outlier claims highlighted in red

Base Year Claim Set with Outlier Claim Present and Same Claim Set Paid with DRGs						Future Claim Set without Outlier Claim Present					Future Claim Set with an Additional Outlier Claim									
DRG	Claim Cost	DRG WT	Outl Thresh	DRG Paid	Outl Payment	All DRG System Payments	DRG	Claim Cost	DRG WT	Outl Thresh	DRG Paid	Outl Payment	All DRG System Payments	DRG	Claim Cost	DRG WT	Outl Thresh	DRG Paid	Outl Payment	All DRG System Payments
A	12,000	2.1667		11,280.14		11,280.14	A	12,000	2.1667		11,280.14		11,280.14	A	12,000	2.1667		11,280.14		11,280.14
A	14,000	2.1667		11,280.14		11,280.14	A	14,000	2.1667		11,280.14		11,280.14	A	14,000	2.1667		11,280.14		11,280.14
B	15,000	2.2778		11,858.60		11,858.60	B	15,000	2.2778		11,858.60		11,858.60	B	15,000	2.2778		11,858.60		11,858.60
B	10,000	2.2778		11,858.60		11,858.60	B	10,000	2.2778		11,858.60		11,858.60	B	10,000	2.2778		11,858.60		11,858.60
B	16,000	2.2778		11,858.60		11,858.60	B	16,000	2.2778		11,858.60		11,858.60	B	16,000	2.2778		11,858.60		11,858.60
C	10,000	1.7778		9,255.50		9,255.50	C	10,000	1.7778		9,255.50		9,255.50	C	10,000	1.7778		9,255.50		9,255.50
C	10,000	1.7778		9,255.50		9,255.50	C	10,000	1.7778		9,255.50		9,255.50	C	10,000	1.7778		9,255.50		9,255.50
C	12,000	1.7778		9,255.50		9,255.50	C	12,000	1.7778		9,255.50		9,255.50	C	12,000	1.7778		9,255.50		9,255.50
C	55,000	1.7778	40,000	9,255.50	11,250	20,505.50	C				-		-	C	55,000	1.7778	40,000	9,255.50	11,250	20,505.50
D	2,500	0.4611		2,400.64		2,400.64	D	2,500	0.4611		2,400.64		2,400.64	D	2,500	0.4611		2,400.64		2,400.64
D	3,000	0.4611		2,400.64		2,400.64	D	3,000	0.4611		2,400.64		2,400.64	D	3,000	0.4611		2,400.64		2,400.64
D	2,800	0.4611		2,400.64		2,400.64	D	2,800	0.4611		2,400.64		2,400.64	D	2,800	0.4611		2,400.64		2,400.64
Total	162,300	19.6611		102,360.00	11,250	113,610.00		107,300	17.8833		93,104.50		93,104.50		217,300	21.4389		111,615.50		134,115.50
Avg Cost	13,525.00																			
Current rate at 70% of cost	9,467.50																			
Total Paid	113,610.00			102,360.00	11,250	113,610.00														
Cost Coverage	70.00%					70.00%					86.77%									61.72%
DRG Rate Determination																				
Total Paid	113,610.00																			
Outlier Carve-Out	11,250.00																			
Inliers	102,360.00																			
Total Weight	19.6611																			
Rate	5,206.22																			

Example 2 — Reimbursement Methodology Does Not Include an Outlier Policy

Outlier claims highlighted in red

Base Year Claim Set with Outlier Claim Present and Same Claim Set Paid with DRGs				Future Claim Set without Outlier Claim Present				Future Claim Set with an Additional Outlier Claim			
DRG	Claim Cost	DRG WT	DRG Paid	DRG	Claim Cost	DRG WT	DRG Paid	DRG	Claim Cost	DRG WT	DRG Paid
A	12,000	2.1667	12,519.89	A	12,000	2.1667	12,519.89	A	12,000	2.1667	12,519.89
A	14,000	2.1667	12,519.89	A	14,000	2.1667	12,519.89	A	14,000	2.1667	12,519.89
B	15,000	2.2778	13,161.94	B	15,000	2.2778	13,161.94	B	15,000	2.2778	13,161.94
B	10,000	2.2778	13,161.94	B	10,000	2.2778	13,161.94	B	10,000	2.2778	13,161.94
B	16,000	2.2778	13,161.94	B	16,000	2.2778	13,161.94	B	16,000	2.2778	13,161.94
C	10,000	1.7778	10,272.73	C	10,000	1.7778	10,272.73	C	10,000	1.7778	10,272.73
C	10,000	1.7778	10,272.73	C	10,000	1.7778	10,272.73	C	10,000	1.7778	10,272.73
C	12,000	1.7778	10,272.73	C	12,000	1.7778	10,272.73	C	12,000	1.7778	10,272.73
C	55,000	1.7778	10,272.73					C	55,000	1.7778	10,272.73
D	2,500	0.4611	2,664.49	D	2,500	0.4611	2,664.49	C	55,000	1.7778	10,272.73
D	3,000	0.4611	2,664.49	D	3,000	0.4611	2,664.49	D	2,500	0.4611	2,664.49
D	2,800	0.4611	2,664.49	D	2,800	0.4611	2,664.49	D	3,000	0.4611	2,664.49
								D	2,800	0.4611	2,664.49
Total	162,300	19.6611	113,610.00	Total	107,300	17.8833	103,337.27	Total	217,300	21.4389	123,882.73
Avg Cost	13,525.00										
Discharge rate at 70%	9,467.50										
Total Paid	113,610.00										
DRG Rate Determination											
Total Paid	113,610.00										
Outlier Carve-Out	-										
Inliers	113,610.00										
Total Weight	19.6611										
Rate	5,778.41										
Cost Coverage	70.00%	70.00%				96.31%					57.01%

Summary

Outlier policies help to mitigate risk if outlier cases occur. As seen in the examples above, if a hospital has an outlier in the base year claim set but fewer outliers in future years, their cost coverage increases regardless if there is or is not an outlier payment methodology in place. If additional outlier cases occur in future years, cost coverage will decrease regardless. However, with an outlier payment methodology in place, this reduction in cost coverage is mitigated.